

**Eleventh International Conference of the
International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR)
University of Muenster
Muenster, Germany
July 22 - 25, 2014**

VOLUNTEERS' PERSPECTIVES ON WORK AND LEISURE

Lionel PROUTEAU

LEMNA (Laboratoire d'économie et de management de Nantes Atlantique)

University of Nantes,

Address: Chemin de la Censive-du-Tertre - 44313 Nantes Cedex 3, France

Email: lionel.prouteau@univ-nantes.fr

Boguslaw SARDINHA

Socius - Research Centre in Economic and Organizational Sociology,

Polytechnic Institute of Setubal.

Address: Campus do IPS, Estefanilha, 2910-503 Setubal – Portugal.

Email: boguslaw.sardinha@esce.ips.pt

1. Introduction

Volunteering is both work and leisure. Therefore, it share some attributes with these two types of activities. As Pearce (1993, p. 9) writes about organizational volunteering: “It is ‘work’ – working within a formal structure to provide a service to others – and it is a ‘leisure activity’ – something done whenever convenient because it is personally rewarding”. Sometimes the focus is put on the work aspect. This is, of course, the case with labor statisticians. When defining the concept of work in a resolution adopted at their 19th International Conference, they classify volunteer work as a form of work among five mutually exclusive forms, i.e. own-use production work, employment work, unpaid trainee work, volunteer work and other work activities (International Labor Organization, 2013). Some researchers also see volunteering chiefly as work. For instance, Wilson and Musick (1997, p. 269) stress that “volunteering is a form of work, much like any other”.

Conversely, other social scientists give priority to the leisure aspect of volunteering. For example, Stebbins (1996) defines this behavior as serious leisure because a significant part of volunteers, as amateurs and hobbyists, tend to be characterized by the following traits (Stebbins, 1992):

- a need to persevere in doing their activities,
- a tendency to have career in their endeavor,
- a significant personal effort based on special knowledge, training or skill, the existence of durable benefits in terms of self-actualization, self-enrichment, renewal of self, self-expression and so on,
- the development of subcultures around their activities;
- a strong identification with their behavior.

In a more recent paper, Stebbins (2013, p. 339) acknowledges the dual nature of volunteering when he writes that “it is possible to see volunteering as both unpaid work and attractive leisure”. However, he prefers to substitute the word ‘activity’ for ‘work’ and he defines volunteering as an ‘intentionally-productive activity’.

If volunteering has common elements with paid work, what are the possible interactions between these two types of activity? This issue can be broken down into two questions. What are the possible effects of volunteering on the job? In the opposite direction, does the employment status have an impact on volunteering? Regarding the first question, volunteering

is seen by economists as a means of accumulating human capital in order to make it easier to find a job or to get a higher wage (Menchik and Weisbrod, 1987). In another vein, Mojza et al (2011) find that volunteering makes recovery experiences (such as psychological detachment from job) easier and consequently it has beneficial subsequent effects on well-being at work. The second question concerning the effects of the job on volunteering can be approached in terms of competing use of time. The more the job is time demanding, the less abundant is the free time available for extra-job activities among which is volunteering. Moreover the impact of time devoted to paid work on volunteering is not of a deterministic nature. However, the number of hours is not the only factor to consider. The timing and scheduling of paid work have also to be taken into account (Musick and Wilson, 2008). In addition, the kind of paid work, the nature of asked tasks, the skills they require and job quality may have an important influence on activities outside the workplace such as volunteering. In this respect, two theoretical approaches compete: the spillover approach and the compensation one (Musick and Wilson, 2008). The former, which is more frequently supported by social scientists, states that an interesting job which requires initiative and self-determination will provide resources that encourage volunteering while a boring job which does not allow self-assertion will lead to passive non-work activities. On the contrary, the compensation approach hypothesizes that individuals will volunteer to fulfil needs not met during the paid work.

Regarding the interplay between volunteering and leisure activities, there is less research. Putnam (1995, 2000) considers that the technological transformation is a threat for civic engagement and volunteering because this process is a source of privatization and individualization of leisure time. De Hart and Dekker (1999), from a time budget survey, find a curvilinear relation between volunteering and some types of leisure such as watching television or reading: those who devote little time and those who devote much time are less inclined to volunteer.

Though our paper comes within the framework of the studies on the connections between volunteering, paid work and leisure, it adopts a particular perspective. Indeed, it aims at examining the possible link between participation in volunteering and the opinions, perceptions or aspirations towards paid work as well as leisure pursuits. Indeed, we think that personal dispositions that incite individuals to volunteer are part of a more general dispositional pattern shaping the attitudes towards the activities that share common traits. In this article personal dispositions refer to enduring attributes of individuals such as values, personality traits or motives (Penner, 2002).

Our argument is as follows. We suggest that certain attitudes and aspirations towards work and leisure convey dispositions which are favorable to the practice of volunteering. For instance, an individual who praises the social utility of paid work may be more inclined to volunteer than an individual who has another conception of work, more oriented towards selfish material benefits, since volunteering is by definition an other-oriented activity. In this respect, it is certainly no coincidence that public sector workers have a higher probability of volunteering than the private sector ones. Indeed, as Musick and Wilson stress (2008, p. 143), « public servants have different ideas about the duties of citizenship, different values and interest. [...] They place a high priority on helping others and being useful to society”. In the same vein, it would be surprising that individuals who consider leisure activities for only entertainment purposes have a strong inclination to volunteer.

Note that in this paper we do not study the connection between volunteering and the behaviors at work or during leisure time but the correlation between volunteering and attitudes or opinions about paid work and leisure. Following Bergman (1998), we consider ‘attitudes’ and ‘opinions’ as synonymous and, like this author, we define an attitude as “the cognitive construction and affective evaluation of an attitude object by an agent” (p. 87). In the next section we describe the data and the variables we use. Our hypotheses are presented in section 3. We give the results of our investigation and we comment on them in section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2. Data and variables

In our paper we use the fourth wave of the European values survey carried out in 2008 and for some countries, in 2009. This survey has several interesting features for our purpose. First, there are many questions about values and attitudes towards different domains and aspects of life (family, job, politics, government, social changes and so on). Second, respondents are asked the same questions in all countries. These data are used by the authors interested in values and opinions, either for international comparisons or for the study of changes over times (see for instance: Surkyn and Lesthaeghe, 2004; Gesthuizen and Verbakel, 2011). There have been, since the beginning of the eighties, four waves of this survey.

However, if in each wave of this survey there were several questions about the attitudes towards job and its content, it was only in the fourth wave of the survey that respondents were asked about their views on leisure activities. As a result our empirical materials are limited to this most recent wave. The data were collected from 47 participating countries. Concerning

volunteering, respondents were presented with a list of voluntary organizations or activities and then they were required to say if they belonged to one or several of them and if they had done voluntary unpaid work for them. A respondent is considered as a volunteer if he (she) did such voluntary unpaid work for at least one organization. From the questionnaire, we are not able to know the amount of time dedicated to these voluntary activities or the length of service. Consequently, we can only consider the volunteer participation.

Musick and Wilson (2008, p. 33) rightly emphasize that “distinguishing volunteer work by the setting in which it occurs is potentially very important”. These authors consider three types or domains of volunteering: the service type, the advocacy type and the religious one. In this paper, we draw on their classification but ours is a bit more disaggregated. More precisely, we distinguish six domains or types of volunteering according to the kind of organizations and activities in which respondents are involved.

The first domain concerns 'education, arts, music, cultural activities', 'sports or recreation' and 'youth work (scouts, guides, youth clubs, etc.)'. It is referred to as 'leisure domain' though it also includes education. It groups services which are often members-oriented. A second domain is made up of 'social welfare services for elderly, handicapped or deprived people', 'local community action on issues like poverty, employment, and housing, racial equity' as well as 'health'. It is named 'social domain' and refers to services more often public-oriented.

The third domain includes the organizations whose purposes are: 'Third world development or human rights', 'conservation, the environment, ecology or animal rights', 'women's groups', 'the peace movement' and 'political parties or groups' and we call this domain the 'advocacy' one. A fourth category of activities is identified as 'work-related domain' and includes trades unions as well as professional associations.

The fifth domain concerns religious activities and the last one (termed as 'other') groups the activities which have not been included elsewhere. In short, the difference between our categorization and the one of Musick and Wilson is that the former disaggregates the service domain into two domains ('leisure' and 'social') and the same is done for the advocacy domain ('advocacy' and 'work-related').

The questionnaire of the survey contains several questions about paid work. Some of them refer to general attitudes towards it while others concern the aspects of work which are valued. With respect to the former, respondents were asked how important work was in their life. Response items were: very important, quite important, not important, not at all important.

We define a dummy with value 1 if very important, 0 otherwise. In addition, the respondents were required to say if they agree or disagree with the following statements:

- 'To fully develop your talents, you need to have a job';
- 'It is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it';
- 'People who don't work turn lazy';
- 'Work is a duty towards society';
- 'Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time'.

The responses items were: agree strongly, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, disagree strongly. We define a set of dummies with value 1 if agree strongly and 0 otherwise.

Concerning the attractive attributes of paid work, the questionnaire gave some aspects of a job that people often consider as being important. Respondents were asked to say which ones they personally thought were important. These job aspects were:

- Good pay;
- Pleasant people to work with;
- Not too much pressure;
- Good job security;
- Good hours;
- An opportunity to use initiative;
- A useful job for society;
- Generous holidays;
- Meeting people;
- A job in which you feel you can achieve something;
- A responsible job;
- A job that is interesting;
- A job that meets one's abilities;
- Learning new skills;
- Family friendly;
- Have a say in important decisions;
- People treated equally at the workplace.

For each aspect, we define a dummy with value 1 if the aspect is mentioned and 0 if not mentioned.

Lastly, we have used three other questions but only for employed people. The questionnaire asked if the respondents who had a job were satisfied with it. To that end, they had to choose their degree of satisfaction on a scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (highly satisfied). From the responses to this question we have defined a dummy with value 1 (quite highly-satisfied) if the rank is 8, 9 or 10. Another question concerned the degree of freedom the respondents felt to have in their job. A scale from 1 (none freedom at all) to 10 (a great deal of freedom) was submitted. Once again, we define a dummy with value 1 if the rank is 8, 9 or 10 (quite high degree). Finally, we also retain a question in our investigation about having the responsibility for supervising the work of other employees. The dummy takes the value one if the respondent had such a responsibility and zero otherwise.

As mentioned above, some questions about leisure have been included in the fourth wave of the European values survey. However, they are limited in number. First, like for work, respondents were asked about the importance attached to leisure time in their life. We define a dummy with value 1 if very important, 0 otherwise. Second, the questionnaire gave some aspects of leisure time that some people consider as important and the respondents had to state how important each of these aspects was for them personally. These aspects were the following ones:

- 'Meeting nice people';
- 'Relaxing';
- 'Doing as I want';
- 'Learning something new'.

The response items were: very important, quite important, not important and not important at all. Once again, we define a set of dummies with value 1 if very important and 0 otherwise. We should notice that in the questionnaire leisure time is explicitly defined as time not spent in paid job or housework and consequently, it implicitly includes volunteering.

As control variables, we select several socio-economic and demographic variables which have often been found to be discriminating with respect to volunteering (Musick and Wilson, 2008). These variables are: gender, age (entered in quadratic form), marital status, the size of the household, the level of education, domestic income, having a job or not, church

attendance and the size of the town of residence. In addition, we control for country fixed effects.

3. Hypotheses

As already mentioned, we conjecture that certain attitudes or aspirations towards paid work are more conducive to volunteering than other attitudes are. Among the variables defined in the previous section, what are the ones which may be favorable to this voluntary unpaid work or ‘serious leisure’? First, we consider the attitudes towards paid work and then, we will discuss the attitudes towards leisure time.

Concerning the general attitudes towards work, we can think that people who agree *strongly* with the statement “work is a duty towards society” have a high sense of social responsibility. Therefore, we expect that they should have a higher probability of volunteerism because this activity is known to be positively associated with social responsibility (Rossi, 2001). On the other hand, if individuals attach a too great importance to a job, they implicitly under-value the other activities for which they have probably less inclination. In particular, they will be less engaged in volunteering. As for the persons who consider that people who do not work become idle, they seem to ignore that there are, outside of paid work, other types of productive activities among which is volunteering. Such an ignorance probably conveys a low interest in these extra-job activities. Therefore we make the following hypotheses:

H1: People who agree strongly with the statement ‘work is a duty toward society’ are more inclined to participate in volunteering.

H2: People who agree strongly with the statement ‘work should always come first even if it means less spare time’ are less inclined to volunteer.

H3: Those who agree strongly with the statement ‘People who don’t work turn lazy’ have a lower probability of volunteering.

Regarding the other variables which refer to the general attitudes towards work, predictions are more uncertain. The respondents who declare that work is very important in their life may be less inclined towards volunteering because to attribute a too high importance to paid work can be the sign of an outlook on life very work-centered and impervious to other uses of time (remember that in the questionnaire volunteering is implicitly included in leisure activities). However the importance attached to work may also suggest a dynamic conception of one’s life which would be favorable to another type of productive involvement such as volunteer

work. As for Mowen and Sujan (2005), they find that a need for activity is a predictor of volunteerism.

It is also difficult to predict the nature of the relation between the propensity to volunteer and the statement ‘to fully develop your talents, you need a job’. On the one hand, those who agree strongly with this view may be unfavorable to volunteering if they attribute an aptitude to develop one’s talents to paid work alone. On the other hand, this opinion may again convey the idea that a job is a part of an active lifestyle encouraging volunteering. Lastly, the predictive content of a strong agreement with the statement ‘it is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it’ is unsure since this statement can refer to different situations depending on whether those who receive money cannot (because of their age or their health status) or do not want to work (because of their idleness).

What can we say about the possible relation between the desirable attributes of a job and volunteering? We argue that people who value the useful character of the job for society more generally express other-oriented feelings as well as a sense of social responsibility. Research on volunteering has shown that this behavior is encouraged by such personal dispositions, whether these dispositions are theoretically understood in terms of personality traits (see Carlo et al., 2005), in terms of prosocial behavior (Penner and Finkelstein, 1998; Penner, 2002) or in terms of motivational functions (Clary et al, 1996; Clary et al, 1998)¹.

H4: People who mention the aspect ‘a useful job for society’ as important aspect are more liable to volunteer.

Some aspects of a job suggested by the questionnaire pertain to intrinsic motivations rather than extrinsic ones. This distinction derives from Deci and Ryan’s self-determination theory (1985). Intrinsic motivation refers to an action which is inherently enjoyable while extrinsic motivation is based on the pursuit of a separable output. Deci and Ryan (1985, 2005) argue that intrinsic motivations are enhanced by the satisfaction of three psychological needs during action: autonomy, competence and relatedness. Drawing on this theoretical framework, we suggest that the following aspects of a job allude to intrinsic motivations:

- ‘An opportunity to use initiative’ (need for autonomy);

¹ Carlo et al (2005) find that ‘agreeableness’ has a strong relation with volunteering. Penner and Finkelstein (1998) as well as Penner (2002) show that other-oriented empathy is a predictor of volunteering. Clary et al (1996) conclude from a national survey from the United States, that the most important function served by volunteering was Values. This function refers to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others.

- A responsible job (need for autonomy);
- Having a say in important decision (need for self-direction);
- A job in which you feel you can achieve something (need for competence);
- A job that meets one's abilities (need for competence);
- Pleasant people to work with (need for relatedness);
- Meeting people (need for relatedness).

If preferences and attitudes are consistent from a type of activity (paid work) to another (voluntary unpaid work), people who value intrinsic motivations in the workplace would be more inclined to volunteering. Indeed, Finkelstein (2009) finds that intrinsic motivations correlate positively with a volunteer self-concept (see also Boezeman and Ellemers, 2009). From a complementary point of view, we can expect that the individuals who praise interpersonal relations will have a higher probability of volunteering because this activity is stimulated by a relational motive (Prouteau and Wolff, 2007).

H5a: People who appreciate the job aspect 'an opportunity to use initiative' have a higher probability of volunteering.

H5b: People interested in the aspect 'a responsible job' have a higher probability of volunteering.

H5c: People who mention the job aspect 'Having a say in important decision' have a higher probability of volunteering.

H5d: The aspect 'A job in which you feel you can achieve something' is positively correlated with the propensity to volunteer.

H5e: People who put forward the aspect 'A job that meets one's abilities' in the workplace have a higher likelihood of volunteering.

H5f: People who value 'Pleasant people to work with' and 'Meeting people' are more inclined towards volunteering.

The desire to learn is a disposition favorable to volunteering (Mowen and Sujun, 2005). It forms part of the 'understanding' motive which has been shown to be a motivational function served by this type of activity (Clary et al, 1998). Consequently, we can expect that people

who mention this aspect as an important attribute of paid work will also have a higher propensity to volunteer.

H6: People who consider that learning new skills is an important aspect of a job have a higher probability of volunteering.

Pearce (1993, p. 55) stresses that the organizational context of volunteering is “egalitarian in nature” (see also Boezeman and Ellemers, 2009). Therefore we can expect that people who support equality in the workplace will be also attracted by voluntary unpaid work.

H7: ‘People treated equally at the workplace’ is an aspect of a job which is positively correlated to the practice of volunteering.

On the contrary, the attributes of a job that belong to the least autonomous extrinsic motivations, the ones that Deci and Ryan (2000) label as external regulation category, would be negatively associated to volunteering. Two aspects are more particularly concerned in the questionnaire: the ‘good pay’ and the ‘generous holidays’ aspects. Regarding the former, an individual who gives priority to earned income will be encouraged to favor paid work over the other types of activity and consequently over volunteering, except if he (she) considers this unpaid work as an investment in human capital driven by an expectation of an increasing in future earnings. With respect to the latter aspect, putting the accent on holidays implicitly depreciates the other uses of free time such as volunteering. As for it, the job aspect ‘not too much pressure’ suggests a lack of dynamism and people who mention it could be less inclined to volunteer.

H8: People who value the aspect ‘good pay’ will be less liable to volunteer.

H9: People who value ‘generous holidays’ have a lower probability of volunteering.

H10: People who mention ‘not too much pressure’ as an important aspect of job are less inclined to volunteer.

The other aspects of a job have an unclear relation with the likelihood of volunteering. ‘Good job security’ is an attribute which refers to risk aversion but, to the best of our knowledge, there is no research about the risk attitude of volunteers compared with non-volunteers. The potential impact of the ‘good hours’ aspect on the propensity to volunteer is ambivalent. It is a material attribute of a job which can be disregarded by intrinsically motivated people, as the ‘good pay’ or ‘good holidays’ aspects are by the same people. In this case, the relation with volunteering might be negative. On the other hand, volunteers are not insensitive to the

scheduling of a job and the ‘good hours’ aspect might be favorable to giving time. The sentence ‘a job that is interesting’ is too vague to allow prediction: what is the nature of the interest? Is it an intrinsic interest or an extrinsic one? Finally, in our opinion, there is no evident predictive relation between a family friendly job and volunteering.

The last three variables associated with paid work concern only employed people. The first of them refers to the degree of decision-making freedom. The higher this degree is, the more self-directed work is. Studying the spillover effects of job content on volunteering, Wilson and Musick (1997) find that self-directed workers are more likely to volunteer even after control for education level. They explain this result by arguing that “self-direction provides the resources necessary to be a competent volunteer” (p. 267). The second variable relates to the responsibility for supervision of other employees. This variable can doubtlessly be understood as an indicator of occupational status. The workers who have such a responsibility are at the top of the occupational ladder. It is likely that they have a high feeling of self-efficacy. Such a feeling is conducive to volunteering (Lindenmeier, 2008). More generally, it has been shown on many occasions that a high occupational status (professionals, managers) is associated with a higher inclination to volunteer (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Regarding the third variable, degree of job satisfaction, the predictions are more uncertain. Musik and Wilson (2008) maintain that there are no robust results about the effects of job satisfaction on volunteering. They argue that it is better to use an indicator in terms of satisfaction with life in general. However, such an indicator is exposed to a reverse causality problem: people who are satisfied with life in general may be more inclined to volunteer but conversely they may be satisfied because they volunteer. This problem is less evident with job satisfaction and for employed people we can expect a high degree of correlation between these two registers of satisfaction². In short, we assume that workers who have a high level of job satisfaction may be more inclined to do activities such as volunteering in an organizational context because such a context shares some common traits with the workplace.

H11: People having a high degree of job satisfaction are more inclined to volunteer.

H12: People who have a high degree of decision-making freedom in their job are more likely to volunteer.

² The questionnaire also asked the respondents about the degree of satisfaction with their life (rank from 1 to 10). The Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient between satisfaction with life and satisfaction with job is 0. With p-value <0.0001.

H13: People having any responsibility for supervision of other employees volunteer more.

Concerning the attitudinal variables towards leisure, we expect that the respondents who view leisure time as very important in their life have a higher probability of volunteering. Indeed, since leisure time is defined in the questionnaire as time spent outside paid work or housework, it includes volunteering. In addition, because volunteering is rich in relational goods, it would be more frequent among people who mention that meeting nice people is an important aspect of leisure. As with preferences about paid work (see hypothesis 6), we expect that the respondents who like to learn something new during leisure time are more likely to volunteer. On the contrary, volunteering fits in badly with the wish to do as one want during leisure time because volunteer work is a collectively organized activity with its constraints which are certainly less strong than at workplace but which exist nonetheless. The nature of the relation between the relaxing aspect of leisure and volunteering is ambiguous. On the one hand, one can think that the word ‘relaxing’ refers to a relatively inactive pastime which bears little relationship with volunteering. On the other hand, it has been shown that volunteering may facilitate psychological detachment from work (Mojza et al., 2010) and, consequently, it may be thought of as a relaxing activity.

H14: People who consider leisure time as very important in life volunteer more.

H15: People who mention “meeting nice people” as an important aspect of leisure are more inclined to volunteer.

H16: People who want to learn something new during leisure have a higher probability of volunteering.

H17: The desire to do as one wants during leisure is negatively correlated with volunteering.

Now we turn to the results of econometric analysis to investigate the relevance of our hypotheses.

4. Results

For our econometric investigation, we use a Probit model. The dependent variable is the participation in volunteering. After deleting the observations for which responses to attitudinal variables are missing, we have 52,448 individuals in our sample. With respect to the socio-demographic characteristics, the comparison between the deleted population and the total sample shows that women, old persons as well as people with low domestic income and low education level are over-represented among the deleted population. These deleted

observations might be a potential source of bias in estimation. So, we have made complementary investigations to better examine this risk. To test the soundness of our estimates, we have also run regressions on an enlarged sample which keeps observations with unknown values of the attitudinal variables. To this end, we assign the missing values for each variable to a supplementary category created for the occasion. The comparison between the results from this enlarged sample (unreported here) to those drawn from the sample without missing data does not show a substantial gap, the observed differences concerning chiefly the level of significance of some coefficients. The explicative variables are the attitudes towards paid work and leisure time, socio-economic control variables and country effects. Because different types of volunteering may appeal to different personal dispositions (Musick and Wilson, 2008) we perform our econometric analysis on the different domains of volunteering.

Researchers have investigated the differences in traits of personality, motivations or values according to certain demographic characteristics, particularly gender and age. For instance Costa et al. (2001) study the gender differences in personality traits and Lehman et al. (2013) investigate the age and gender differences in motivational manifestations of the Big Five. Other research has concerned age or gender differences whether in work motivation (Inceoglu, 2012), in perception of leisure (Weygandt White, Gruber, 1985; Fontenelle, Zinkhan, 1993) or towards volunteering (Davila, Diaz-Morales, 2009; Widjaja, 2010; Wymer, 2011). Consequently, we cannot exclude the possibility that the relations between personal dispositions towards paid work or leisure and volunteering differ from one segment of a population to another. In this respect, we make three successive distinctions. The first one relates to gender and allows us to compare men and women. The second distinction refers to age and separates the population under age 45 from the population aged 45 and over. The third distinction deals with the employment status and differentiates employed from not employed people. Coefficients are given in terms of marginal effects estimated at sample means. Table 1 presents the results relating to the domains of volunteering and Table 2 shows those concerning the different segments of population. The coefficients associated to socioeconomic and demographic variables are given in the two tables but they are not commented on because they are beyond the scope of the present paper.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 here

Several hypotheses receive a strong support from these results. Thus to give importance to the social usefulness of the job is systematically positively correlated with volunteering (H4),

whatever the type of engagement and the segment of population (Tables 1 and 2). To mention this aspect as important increases the probability of volunteering by more than three percentage points. Similarly, people who value the use of initiative at workplace have a higher inclination to volunteer except in the religious domain (H5a). This is also the case for the persons who see as important a job in which they feel they can achieve something (H5d), the positive relation with volunteering being observed in all regressions except in the ‘social’, ‘religion’ and ‘other’ domains. On the contrary, and as predicted, people who rate ‘good pay’ and ‘generous’ holidays highly tend to volunteer less (H8 and H9).

Only two types of volunteering do not support H1 (the ‘work-related’ and the ‘other’ ones) and only one (the ‘work-related’ volunteering) is not negatively correlated with the ‘generous holidays’ aspect. Taken as a whole, this confirms that materialistic values are not conducive to volunteering (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Though a bit less systematically, some other hypotheses are also supported. We predicted that people who agree strongly with the statement ‘work is a duty toward society’ have a higher propensity to volunteer (H1). This prediction is verified except for religious volunteering as well as the one in the ‘other’ domain and for the population under age 45. Results are also consistent with H5c since the individuals who endorse the opinion that ‘having a say in important decisions is an important aspect of a job’ are more inclined to volunteer except for the religious volunteering, for employed and for the population under age 45.

As predicted (H10), the respondents who fear too much pressure in a job volunteer less. Though this result is observed only for ‘aggregated’ and ‘leisure’ volunteering, it is proven for all segments of the population with different levels of statistical significance. As expected (H2), the persons who consider that work should always come first even if it means less spare time have a lower likelihood of volunteering. This negative relation is statistically significant in four domains out of seven (‘aggregated’, ‘leisure’, ‘religion’ and ‘other’) as well as for all segments of population except women. Results support also partially H3 and H6. Indeed, the negative correlation between the statement ‘people who don’t work turn lazy’ and volunteering is noted for the ‘aggregated’, ‘social’ (with a significance level of 10%) and ‘advocacy’ domains as well as for the employed population, men and the population aged 45 and over. On the other hand, people who mention ‘learning new skills’ as an important aspect of a job volunteer more in the ‘aggregated’ (with a significance level of 10%), ‘social’ and ‘leisure’ domains as well as among the employed persons, women and the population under age 45.

However some hypotheses are not confirmed by our results. It is the case for H5e. The respondents who give importance to the relational aspect of a job ('pleasant people to work with' and 'meeting people') do not volunteer more with only one exception for the aspect 'meeting people' in the 'leisure' domain of volunteering. Similarly, H5b, which predicted that the individuals interested by a 'responsible job' would have a higher propensity to do voluntary unpaid work, is only confirmed in the work-related domain of volunteering (with a significance level of 10%) whereas the relation is negative in the religion domain. More importantly, H5e and H7 are clearly invalidated. H5e predicted that people who value a job that meets one's abilities are more inclined to volunteer. The opposite is true in three domains of volunteering out of seven (social, work-related and other) and for the population under age 45. In two of these cases (population under age 45 and the 'other' domain of volunteering) the significance level is of 10% which is rather high but what remains clear is that the relation which is observed is not the expected one. With regards to H7, rejection of the prediction is still more obvious. Indeed, the egalitarian aspiration towards workplace ('people treated equally') is not positively correlated with volunteering but the opposite is true in a majority of cases (four domains out of seven and five segments of population out of six). These two last results are very surprising. The former seems to contradict the attractive character of the self-efficacy feeling and its positive impact on volunteering. The latter challenges the egalitarianism attributed to volunteers.

Concerning several aspects of paid work, we had no unambiguous prediction with respect to their relation with volunteering. For some of them, our investigation confirms this indecisiveness. That is the case for the aspect 'a job that is interesting'. Only women who mention it as important are more inclined to volunteer. To give attention to the aspect 'family friendly' of a job is positively correlated with volunteering only in the 'religion' domain and for the population aged 45 and over. On the other hand, some unpredicted relations come into view. For instance people who appreciate good hours in a job have a lower propensity to give time except in the 'social', 'work-related' and 'other' domains and for people under age 45. The coefficients of the aspect 'good job security' are significant, the correlation with volunteering appear to be negative which suggests that volunteers might be less risk adverse concerning jobs.

The persons who agree strongly with the opinion that 'to fully develop your talents you need to have a job' volunteer more only in the 'social' and 'work-related' domains. Those who consider that 'it is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it' are more

inclined towards voluntary unpaid work in four cases (the ‘aggregated’ and ‘religion’ domains, men and people under age 45). Such relations are not easy to explain.

For the employed population, we introduced three additional variables related to the degree of satisfaction, the decision-making freedom and the fact of having any responsibility for supervision of other employees. For these three aspects, we expected a positive correlation with volunteering (H11, H12, H13). These hypotheses are strongly supported by our results (table 2). The support for H12 corroborates the approach of Wilson and Musick (1997) in terms of spillover effects of self-direction on volunteering. It confirms that the satisfaction of such motivations of intrinsic nature in the work-place tends to favor the practice of voluntary unpaid work³. In order to test the robustness of these three findings, we have run similar regressions on employed people for each domain of volunteering. This exercise, whose results are not presented in this paper but are available upon request, shows that H12 is verified only in the leisure domain while H11 and H13 are verified in four domains (social, leisure, work-related and advocacy).

Concerning leisure, findings are quite in line with our hypotheses. As predicted, to consider leisure as very important in life is positively associated with volunteering in the ‘aggregated’ and ‘leisure’ domains as well as among not employed people and women (H14). The respondents who value the relational aspect of leisure are more inclined to volunteer in the ‘aggregated’ and ‘leisure’ domains (H15). This positive correlation is observed for all the segments of population. Above all, the persons who highly value ‘learning something new’ have also systematically a higher likelihood of volunteering (H16). This result is among the most robust of all. Lastly, people who see as very important the fact of doing as one wants during leisure time have a lower propensity to volunteer except in the religion and other domains and among women and not employed persons.

We did not predict a clear correlation between the relaxing aspect of leisure and volunteering. Table 1 shows that this relation changes according to the domains of volunteering. It is negative in the ‘advocacy’ and ‘religion’ domains but positive in the ‘work-related’ one. This

³ Decision-making freedom is clearly related to intrinsic motivations. Indeed, Deci and Ryan (2000, p. 58) write: “[people] must also experience their behavior to be self-determined if intrinsic motivation is to be maintained or enhanced”

last result is consistent with the argument of Mojza et al (2011) according to which volunteering may be a recovery experience of psychological detachment from work.

To sum up, the majority of our hypotheses receive support from our investigation, sometimes very strongly, sometimes more partially. The opinion according to which work is a duty towards society is generally associated with a higher probability of volunteering. Two types of aspiration regarding job aspects are positively correlated with volunteer work. The first type conveys a prosocial attitude which consists in valuing the social usefulness of a job. The second type deals with some job attributes which refers to intrinsic motivations, mainly: sense of achievement, initiative, participation in decisions and learning. For the not employed persons these aspirations and attitudes concern a virtual situation. For the employed ones, having a job is a tangible reality. With respect to this segment of population, our investigation confirms the existence of spillover effects of job content on volunteering: people highly satisfied with their job, those who have a high degree of self-direction in the workplace and those who have responsibilities for supervision are more inclined to give time. Two aspects of leisure seem to be particularly favorable to volunteering: the learning aspect and the relational one. However our study leads us to two surprising and counterintuitive observations: people who advocate an egalitarian workplace are less prone to volunteer and the same is true for the individuals who endorse the idea that a job has to meet one's abilities.

5. Conclusion

This paper works on the assumption that personal dispositions, whether in terms of personality traits, motivations, values or attitudes, have a certain degree of consistence and stability across contexts. Such a supposition does not deny that human behavior is influenced by the situation. Instead, our approach has to be considered in an interactionist framework for which both dispositions and situations contribute to explain human behavior⁴. In the same vein, we do not maintain that personal dispositions are the most important determinants of behavior. Regarding volunteering, we agree with Musick and Wilson (2008) who stress that resources and opportunities matter in explaining this type of engagement. The results from our econometric investigation show that cultural capital (of which education level is a good proxy) and social networks (of which education level but also the frequency of church attendance are indicators) have a substantial higher impact on volunteering than personal

⁴ For an explanation of the interactionist point of view with regards to personality traits see for instance Matthews et al (2009), chapter 2.

attitudes towards paid work and leisure have. However, we cannot ignore the effect of dispositions.

Consequently, we examine the possible effects of some attitudes and aspirations towards paid work and leisure on the likelihood of volunteering. In this respect, the hypothesized (relative) stability of such attitudes and aspirations seems plausible in view of the fact that volunteering is both work and leisure. Unfortunately, from the data set we use, we cannot know the nature of individuals' dispositions towards volunteering. However, we can infer some of them from the literature on this topic even if research leads rarely to consensual conclusions.

Our study provides some interesting results. In particular we find that there are positive correlations between a prosocial attitude towards a job and volunteering as well as between some important intrinsic motivations vis-à-vis a job (achievement, initiative, participation in decision, learning) and the propensity to do volunteer work. A strong desire to learn through leisure activities and the accent put on the relational aspect of these activities are also associated with a higher inclination to volunteer. With respect to the employed persons, our results confirms the spillover thesis: a high degree of job satisfaction, a high degree of freedom in the workplace and the exercise of supervisor responsibilities are positively correlated to the practice of volunteering.

However, we find two unexpected results which border on conundrums. First, an egalitarian point of view towards the workplace is negatively correlated with the participation in volunteering. Second, to consider as important that a job meets one's abilities is also negatively associated to this engagement. These bewildering results call for confirmation and more generally, our other results have to be corroborated from other data. Indeed, our work has an exploratory character. The attitude and aspiration indicators are rather rough but we are dependent on questions asked in the survey. In addition, we acknowledge that our study is more correlational than causal. Some observed associations between dispositions and volunteering may be exposed to the problem of reverse causality. For instance the prosocial attitudes towards paid work may enhance the inclination to volunteer but reciprocally, people may attribute some importance to the social utility of a job because they volunteer.

Finally, we think that the relations between attitudes towards volunteering and other types of activities such as paid work and leisure are a worthy and stimulating object of study which needs further research. However, it requires comprehensive data sets covering these activities with a great degree of detail and accuracy.

References

- Bergman M. M. (1998), A Theoretical Note on the Differences between Attitudes, Opinions, and Values”, *Swiss Political Science Review*, vol. 4 n° 2, p. 81-93.
- Boezeman E. J., Ellemers N. (2009), « Intrinsic need satisfaction and the job attitudes of volunteers versus employees working in a charitable volunteer organization », *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 82, p. 897-914.
- Carlo G., Okun M. A., Knight G. P., de Guzman M. R. T. (2005), “The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation”, *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 38, p. 1293-1305.
- Clary E. G., Snyder M., Stukas A. A. (1996), “Volunteers’ Motivations: Findings From a National Survey”, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 25 n° 4, p. 485-505.
- Clary E. G., Snyder M., Ridge R. D., Copeland J., Stukas A. A., Haugen J. Miene P. (1998), “Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 74 n° 6, p. 1516-1530.
- Costa P. T., Terracciano A., McCrae R. R. (2001), “Gender Differences in Personality Traits Across Cultures: Robust and Surprising Findings”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 81 n° 2, p. 322-331.
- De Hart J., Dekker P. (1999), « Civic engagement and volunteering in the Netherlands: A ‘Putmanian’ Analysis”, in Van Deth J., Maraffi M., Newton K., Whiteley P., *Social Capital and European Democracy*, London:Routledge, p. 75-109.
- Davila M. C., Diaz-Morales J. F. (2009), “Age and motives for volunteering: Further evidence”, *Europe’s Journal of Psychology*, vol. 5 n° 2, p. 82-95.
- Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. (1985), *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*, New York and London, Plenum Press.
- Deci E. L., Ryan R. M. (2000), « Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions », *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 25, p. 54-67.
- Finkelstein M. A. (2009), “Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivational orientations and the volunteer process”, *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 46, p. 653-658.
- Fontenelle de S., Zinkhan G. M. (1993), « Gender Differences in the Perception of Leisure: A Conceptual Model”, *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 20, p. 534-540.

- Gesthuizen M., Verbakel E. (2011), "Job preferences in Europe. Test for scale invariance and examining cross-national variations using EVS", *European Societies*, vol. 13 n° 5, p. 663-686.
- Inceoglu I., Segers J., Bartram D. (2012), "Age-related differences in work motivations", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 85, p. 300-329.
- International Labor Organization (2013), *Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization*, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_230304.pdf
- Lehmann R., Denissen J. J. A., Allemand M., Penke L. (2012), "Age and Gender Differences in Motivational Manifestations of the Big Five From Age 16 to 60", *Developmental Psychology*, vol. 49 n° 2, p. 365-383.
- Lindenmeier J. (2008), "Promoting Volunteering: Effects of Self-Efficacy, Advertisement-Induced Emotional Arousal, Perceived Costs of Volunteering, and Message Framing", *Voluntas*, vol. 19, p. 43-65.
- Matthews G., Deary I. J., Whiteman M. C. (2009), *Personality Traits*, third edition, Cambridge U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Menchik P. L. et B. A. Weisbrod (1987), "Voluntary labor supply", *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 32, p. 159-183.
- Mowen J. C., Sujan H. (2005), "Volunteer Behavior: A Hierarchical Model Approach for Investigating Its Trait and Functional Motive Antecedents", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, vol. 15 n° 2, p. 170-182.
- Mojza E. J., Sonnentag S., Bornemann C. (2011), "Volunteer work as a valuable leisure-time activity: A day-level study on volunteer work, non-work experiences, and well-being at work", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 84, p. 123-152.
- Musick M. A., Wilson J. (2008), *Volunteers. A Social Profile*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Pearce J. L. (1993), *The organizational behavior of unpaid workers*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Penner L. A. (2002), "Dispositional and Organizational Influences on Sustained Volunteerism: An Interactionist Perspective", *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 58 n° 3, p. 447-467.
- Penner L. A., Finkelstein M. A. (1998), « Dispositional and Structural Determinants of Volunteerism », *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 74 n° 2, p. 525-537.
- Prouteau L, Wolff F.C. (2008), "On the relational motive for volunteer work", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, vol. 29, pp. 314-335.
- Putnam R. D. (1995), "Bowling alone: America's Declining Social Capital", *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 6, p. 65-78.
- Putnam R. D. (2000), *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Rossi A. S. (2001), "Domains and Dimensions of Social Responsibility. A Sociodemographic Profile", in Rossi A. S. (Ed.), *Caring and Doing for Others: Social Responsibility in the Domains of Family, Work, and Community*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 97-134.
- Stebbins R. (1992), *Amateurs, Professionals and Serious Leisure*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Stebbins R. (1996), "Volunteering: A Serious Leisure Perspective", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 25, p. 211-224.
- Stebbins R. (2013), "Unpaid work of love: defining the work-leisure axis of volunteering", *Leisure Studies*, vol. 32 n° 3, p. 339-345.
- Surkyn J., Lesthaeghe R. (2004), "Value orientations and the second demographic transition (SDT) in northern, western and southern Europe: an update", *Demographic Research*, special collection 3, p. 45-86.
- Weygandt White J., Gruber K. J. (1985), "Gender-Differences in Leisure-Need Activity Patterns", *Sex Roles*, vol. 12 n° 11/12, p. 1173-1186.
- Widjaja E. (2010), "Motivation Behind Volunteerism", *CMC Senior Theses*, Paper 4. http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/4
- Wilson J., Musick M. A. (1997), "Work and Volunteering: The Long Arm of the Job", *Social Forces*, vol. 76, p. 251-272.

Wymer W. (2011), “The Implications of Sex Differences on Volunteer Preferences”,
Voluntas, vol. 22, p. 831-851.

Table 1. Attitudes and aspirations towards work and leisure and propensity to volunteer according to the type of engagement.

Variables	Types of volunteering	Aggregated	Social	Leisure	Work-related	Advocacy	Religion	Other
<i>Very important in life</i>								
Work				-0.0043*			-0.0035***	
Leisure time	0.0125***			0.0127***				
<i>Important aspects of a job</i>								
Good pay	-0.0305***	-0.0110***		-0.0079**		-0.0096***	-0.0027*	
Pleasant people to work with								
Not too much pressure	-0.0184***			-0.0138***				
Good job security	-0.0085*					-0.0074***		
Good hours	-0.0119***			-0.0046*		-0.0048**	-0.0027**	
An opportunity to use initiative	0.0236***	0.0082***		0.0099***	0.0046***	0.0126***		0.0037**
A useful job for society	0.0329***	0.0124***		0.0086***	0.0034**	0.0152***	0.0088***	0.0051***
Generous holidays	-0.0215***	-0.0089***		-0.0082***		-0.0065***	-0.0068***	-0.0051***
Meeting people		0.0040**						
A job in which you feel you can achieve something	0.0135***			0.0118***	0.0029*	0.0048**		
A responsible job					0.0028*		-0.0021**	
A job that is interesting								
A job that meets one's abilities		-0.0057***			-0.0039**			-0.0026*
Learning new skills	0.0086*	0.0044**		0.0067**				
Family friendly							0.0031**	
Have a say in important decisions	0.0134***	0.0037**		0.0068**	0.0075***	0.0097***		0.0028*
People treated equally at the workplace	-0.0159***			-0.0072**	-0.0031**	-0.0058**		
<i>Agree strongly with the following opinions about work:</i>								
To fully develop your talents, you need to have a job		0.0048***			0.0049***			
It is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it	0.0081*						0.0049***	
People who don't work turn lazy	-0.0091**	-0.0031*				-0.0069***		
Work is a duty towards society	0.0195***	0.0041**		0.0095***	0.0050***	0.0094***		
Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time	-0.0198***			-0.0088***			-0.0037***	-0.0028*
<i>Aspects of leisure considered as very important:</i>								
Meeting nice people	0.0182***			0.0119***				
Relaxing					0.0035**	-0.0038*	-0.0035***	
Doing as I want	-0.0121***	-0.0034**		-0.0060**	-0.0026*	-0.0048**		
Learning something new	0.0222***	0.0077***		0.0094***	0.0044***	0.0101***	0.0046***	0.0048***

Table 1 (continued). Attitudes and aspirations towards work and leisure and propensity to volunteer according to the type of engagement.

Variables	Type of volunteering	Aggregated	Social	Leisure	Work-related	Advocacy	Religion	Other
<i>Socio-economic and demographic variables</i>								
Gender								
Female		-0.0346***	0.0062***	-0.0313***	-0.0084***			-0.0091***
Age								
		0.0029***	0.0008***		0.0014***	0.0019***	0.0005**	0.0007***
Age square (10E-4)								
		-0.2641***	-0.5153*		-0.1033***	-0.1741***	-0.3856*	-0.04657**
Marital status								
Divorced or separated		-0.0267***		-0.0124***	-0.0059**		-0.0045**	
Widowed		-0.0203**		-0.0109**	-0.0072***			
Married or registered partnership		-0.0227***		-0.0167***				
Number of individuals in the household								
2				0.0165***				
3				0.0247***		-0.0077**		
4		0.0183**	-0.0065**	0.0341***				
5 and over		0.0255***		0.0404***				
Educational level								
Basic professional and secondary intermediate		0.0375***	0.0120***	0.0099*		0.0151***		0.0056*
Full secondary, maturity level certificate		0.0861***	0.0201***	0.0405***	0.0151***	0.0299***	0.0064***	0.0111***
Higher education		0.1623***	0.0345***	0.0818***	0.0381***	0.0664***	0.0140***	0.0170***
Domestic income								
Between the first quartile and the median		0.0128**		-0.0081*		0.0077**		
Between the median and the third quartile		0.0227***	0.0110***			0.0068*		
Above the third quartile		0.0410***	0.0099***	0.0132**	0.0052*	0.0120***		0.0059**
Unknown					-0.0061**			
Having a paid job								
		0.0222***	-0.0046***	0.0074***	0.0181***			-0.0025*
Size of town								
2,000-20,000 inhabitants		-0.0266***		-0.0105***		-0.0141***		
20,000-100,000 inhabitants		-0.0595***	-0.0052**	-0.0278***	-0.0056***	-0.0217***	-0.0059***	-0.0051***
More than 100,000 inhabitants		-0.0673***	-0.0066***	-0.0277***	-0.0084***	-0.0242***	-0.0072***	-0.0085***
Unknown		-0.0571***	-0.0073**	-0.0247***	-0.0119***	-0.0283***	-0.0061***	-0.0106***
Religious service attendance								
From once a month to once a year		0.607***	0.0130***	0.0220***	0.0040***	0.0118***	0.0375***	0.0080***
At least once a week		0.1671***	0.0327***	0.0273***		0.0295***	0.2103***	0.0121***
Country fixed-effects								
		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Predicted probability								
		0.1804	0.0310	0.0701	0.0248	0.0502	0.0190	0.0211
Log-likelihood								
		-23,783.48	-8,530.89	-14,786.80	-7,468.79	-11,496.39	-7,449.49	-6,659.44
Number of observations								
		52,448						

Coefficients are marginal effects (estimated at sample means) from Probit Model.

For the socio-economic and demographic variables, the reference categories are: male for gender, never married and never registered partnership for marital status, one for the size of the household, no education or elementary education for educational level, below the first quartile for domestic income, less than 2,000 inhabitants for the size of town and less once a year or never for religious service attendance. Only the statistically significant results are shown. Significance levels are respectively 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*).

Source: EVS 2008.

Table 2. Attitudes and aspirations towards work and leisure and propensity to volunteer among some segments of population.

Variables	Segment of population	Not Employed	Employed	Men	Women	Age <45	Age >=45
<i>Very important in life</i>							
Work			-0.0213***		-0.0101**	-0.0120**	
Leisure time		0.0210***			0.0159***		0.183***
<i>Important aspects of a job</i>							
Good pay		-0.0242***	-0.0331***	-0.0273***	-0.0318***	-0.0375***	-0.0233***
Pleasant people to work with		-0.0141**	-0.0200***	-0.0171**	-0.0194***	-0.0267***	-0.0117*
Not too much pressure					-0.0150***		-0.0110*
Good job security					-0.0100*		-0.0166***
Good hours		-0.0110*	-0.0110*	-0.0136**			
An opportunity to use initiative		0.0210***	0.0233***	0.0313***	0.0168***	0.0166***	0.0283***
A useful job for society		0.0231***	0.0424***	0.0388***	0.0294***	0.0348***	0.0294***
Generous holidays		-0.0276***	-0.0124*	-0.0208***	-0.0223***	-0.0151**	-0.0262***
Meeting people							
A job in which you feel you can achieve something		0.0098*	0.0161**	0.0162**	0.0127**	0.0153**	0.0114*
A responsible job					0.0111**		
A job that is interesting							
A job that meets one's abilities						-0.0108*	
Learning new skills			0.0193***		0.0128**	0.0133**	
Family friendly							0.0102*
Have a say in important decisions		0.0145**		0.0129*	0.0139**		0.0194***
People treated equally at the workplace			-0.0250***	-0.0191***	-0.0136**	-0.0135**	-0.0175***
<i>Agree strongly with the following opinions about work:</i>							
To fully develop your talents, you need to have a job						0.0141**	
It is humiliating to receive money without having to work for it			-0.0124*	0.0132*			-0.0150**
People who don't work turn lazy			0.0166**	-0.0152**			0.0251***
Work is a duty towards society		0.0207***		0.0201***	0.0182***		
Work should always come first, even if it means less spare time		-0.0252***	-0.0145*	-0.0290***		-0.0303***	-0.0135*
<i>Opinions about one's own job</i>		<i>Not applicable</i>		<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Highly satisfied			0.0247***				
High degree of decision-making freedom			0.0139***				
Having any responsibility for supervision of other employees			0.0315***				
<i>Aspects of leisure considered as very important</i>							
Meeting nice people		0.0163*	0.0188***	0.0238***	0.0135***	0.0217***	0.0135**
Relaxing					-0.0095*		
Doing as I want			-0.0156***	-0.0201***		-0.0129**	-0.0130**
Learning something new		0.0180***	0.0230***	0.0155**	0.0266***	0.0122**	0.0322***

Table 2 (continued). Attitudes and aspirations towards work and leisure and propensity to volunteer. Probit model

Variables	Segment of population	Not Employed	Employed	Men	Women	Age <45	Age >=45
Socio-economic and demographic variables							
Gender				<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>		
Female		-0.0369***	-0.0292***			-0.0396***	-0.0272***
Age		0.0020**		0.0023**	0.0034***	-0.0151***	0.0152***
Age square		-0.2427***		-0.2502**	-0.2909***	2.4472***	-1.2433***
Marital status							
Divorced or separated		-0.0217**	-0.0287***	-0.02287*	-0.0307***		
Widowed			-0.0328**		-0.0304***		
Married or registered partnership		-0.0251*	-0.0172**		-0.0329***	-0.0181***	
Number of individuals in the household							
2							
3							
4			0.0219*	0.2736**			0.0225*
5 and over			0.0363***		0.0269**		
Educational level							
Basic professional and secondary intermediate		0.0260***	0.0657***	0.0489***	0.0276***		0.0428***
Full secondary, maturity level certificate		0.0617***	0.1200***	0.1014***	0.0707***	0.0695***	0.0889***
Higher education		0.1342***	0.1937***	0.1746***	0.1461***	0.1352***	0.1849***
Domestic income							
Between the first quartile and the median					0.0199**		
Between the median and the third quartile		0.0247***		0.0252**	0.0260***		0.0273***
Above the third quartile		0.0637***		0.0435***	0.0452***	0.0230**	0.0453***
Unknown		0.0148*	-0.0372***				
Having a paid job		<i>Not applicable</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>		0.0277***	0.0254***	0.0394***
Size of town							
2,000-20,000 inhabitants		-0.0262***	-0.0285***	-0.0364***	-0.0185***	-0.0236***	-0.0311***
20,000-100,000 inhabitants		-0.0483***	-0.0721***	-0.0676***	-0.0521***	-0.0559***	-0.0631***
More than 100,000 inhabitants		-0.0498***	-0.0834***	-0.0727***	-0.0622***	-0.0627***	-0.0711***
Unknown		-0.0493***	-0.0675***	-0.0695***	-0.0478***	-0.0485***	-0.0662***
Religious service attendance							
From once a month to once a year		0.0467***	0.0697***	0.0666***	0.0533***	0.0623***	0.0557***
At least once a week		0.1517***	0.1665***	0.1664***	0.1612***	0.1415***	0.1792***
Country fixed-effects		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>
Predicted probability		0.1377	0.2215	0.2046	0.1599	0.1766	0.1812
Log-likelihood		-9,955.26	-13,668.33	-11,443.55	-12,254.08	-11,425.55	-12,201.15
Number of observations		25,115	27,333	23,796	28,652	25,292	27,156

Coefficients are marginal effects (estimated at sample means) from Probit Model.

*For the socio-economic and demographic variables, the reference categories are: male for gender, never married and never registered partnership for marital status, one for the size of the household, no education or elementary education for educational level, below the first quartile for domestic income, less than 2,000 inhabitants for the size of town and less once a year or never for religious service attendance. Only the statistically significant results are shown. Significance levels are respectively 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*).*

Source: EVS 2008.